REMARKS

1. In the above-captioned Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11, 15-20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Buttner (U.S. Patent No. 2,142,175). Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Buttner in view of Chatterton (U.S. Patent No. 2,534,573). Claims 1-6, 8-10, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Buttner in view of Patchen (U.S. Patent No. 3,785,459). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Buttner in view of Kaufman (U.S. Patent No. 4,231,623). Claims 7 and 21 were rejected given Buttner in view of Patchen and further view of Kaufman. These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

2. Claims 11, 15-20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Buttner. Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Buttner in view of Chatterton. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Buttner in view of Patchen. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Buttner in view of Kaufman. Claims 7 and 21 were rejected given Buttner in view of Patchen and further view of Kaufman. Prior to discussing the merits of the Examiner's position, the applicant believes it would be helpful to first briefly describe and characterize the Buttner reference.

THE BUTTNER REFERENCE

As stated in Buttner:

> According to the invention, a check valve is placed at the bottom or big end bearing end of the column of oil in the connecting rod to retain the column of oil in the connecting rod during that part of the piston stroke when velocity and inertia effects tend to cause the oil to flow in a direction contrary to that required [Column 1, line 54 through column 2, line 4].
>
> The check valve therefore increases the quantity of oil flow at the higher speeds, to an amount above that which would otherwise be obtained, while in addition it restricts the oil flow at slow speeds [Column 2, lines 15-19].
>
> In addition according to the invention the check valve is preferably spring loaded. A spring can be selected which will give any desired variation in spring load between the closed and open positions of the valve in order to give a rate of oil flow of the character required. The spring may be such as to *prevent the*

> *opening of the valve* under the combined effect of the oil pressure and the inertia forces until a certain engine speed is reached with automatic regulation of the rate of oil flow at all higher speeds. [Column 2, lines 20-30, emphasis added]

Buttner therefore describes and shows a check valve 26 that at times prevents the flow of oil between his bearing 17 and 18 and the passage 11 from the bearing to the groove 10 around the pin 6. Presuming for the sake of argument that Buttner's grooves 23 and 19/20 corresponds to the first groove and Buttner's oil duct 11 corresponds to the first passage, when Buttner's check valve 26 closes, it prevents the grooves 23 and 19/20 and oil duct 11 from being in constant fluid communication. Thus, Buttner, as do the other references cited by the Examiner, fails to teach or suggest a *first groove in constant fluid communication with the first passage*, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 11. Hence, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 11 may be passed to allowance.

Buttner further states:

> Grooves 19 and 20 in the bearing surfaces of the half shells 17 and 18 and extending each through an arc of 90° divided equally on either side of the split line of the bearing are provided, and there is thus a *circumferential separation of 90° between the two grooves* [Column 2, lines 19-24, emphasis added].

Buttner therefore describes two grooves 19, 20 in the bearing surfaces of the half shells 17 and 18, which are separated circumferentially and do not extend along the entire circumference of the bearing surface. Buttner's separated grooves teach away from a groove extend along the entire circumference of the bearing surface. Thus, Buttner does not describe, nor is it obvious in light of Buttner, that *the first groove extends across an entire circumference of the bearing surface*, as set forth in dependent claims 7 and 22.

None of the references teaches or suggests that the second groove is disposed in the piston pin bushing, as set forth in dependent claim 24.

Thus, the claims of the present invention are not taught or suggested by Buttner, Chatterton, Patchen, and/or Kaufman. Combining these references fails to teach or yield the invention as claimed. The combination of these references fails to teach or suggest all the elements of the claims. Further, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to make such a combination. Therefore, the present invention is not obvious in light of any combination of Buttner, Chatterton, Patchen, and/or Kaufman.

Furthermore, claims 2-10, 12-15, and 21-25 are dependent upon an independent claim that is shown to be allowable. For all these reasons, the dependent claims are themselves allowable.

3. The Applicant cancels claims 16-20 without prejudice or disclaimer. Cancellation of claims 16-20 is not an admission that Buttner and/or any of the other references renders the limitations obvious. Their cancellation instead reflects the Applicant's desire to expeditiously proceed and prosecute the remaining claims in this application.

4. No new subject matter is introduced by the amendments to the above claims or the addition of the new claims. Claims 3 and 8 are amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

5. The above amendment and response is necessary because it places the application in condition for allowance and was not previously entered because the Examiner first brought the grounds of rejection in the Final Office Action.

6. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication may advance the prosecution of the present application. Notice of allowance of claims 1-15 and 21-25 is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2005 By: Susan L. Lukasik

Susan L. Lukasik
Registration No. 35,261
Attorney for Applicant
International Engine Intellectual Property
Company, LLC
Voice: (630) 753-2172
Fax: (630) 753-3982